UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,546	06/27/2003	Yohei Maekawa	116210	7424

25944 7590 04/16/2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER	
CHANG, JULIAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/607,546	MAEKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JULIAN CHANG	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 17-68* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 17-68* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to communication filed on 01/22/08. Claims 1-11 and 17-68 are pending, and have been examined. Any rejection(s) not repeated below has been withdrawn.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is *clearly indicative of the invention* to which the claims are directed. Applicant's new title is not clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The title is overly broad, and covers just about any networked system in existence.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 5 is improperly dependent on itself. **Appropriate correction is required.** This objection has been necessitated by "amendment". In order to expedite prosecution, claim 5 will be examined as dependent on claim 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 46-49 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Venkatraman, et al (US 5,956,487), hereinafter "Venkatraman".

5. Regarding claims 46-47, Venkatraman teaches a system comprising:

an information storage that stores service information (Fig. 1B, Web Page 18; Fig. 3) including link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B, Memory 210); and

a information transmitting system that transmits the service information to an information output device when said electronic device is selected by the information output device (Fig. 1B, Input/Output Circuitry 220),

an information output device determining whether the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output (Fig. 3, Elements 66-68), displaying a listing of general information (Fig. 3), such that the general information is selectable by a user (Fig. 3, hyperlinks 66-68; Col. 7, lines 5-15), only when it is determined that the service information includes the general information (Fig. 3; A system inherently can only display general information that is received. If no general information is present in the service information, the general information cannot be displayed.), wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in

accordance with the link information (URL for the device 10, Col. 3, lines 17-26), and obtaining and outputting the data to be output in accordance with the link information transmitted from said link information transmitting system that is associated with the selected general information (col. 7, lines 5-15).

6. Regarding claims 48, Venkatraman teaches a system comprising:

an information storage that stores service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B, Memory 210); and

an information transmitting system that transmits the service information (Fig. 1B, Web Page 18; Fig. 3) including link information to an information output device when said electronic device is selected by the information output device (Fig. 1B, Input/Output Circuitry 220),

the information output device determining whether the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output (Fig. 3, Elements 66-68), displaying a listing of general information (Fig. 3), such that the general information is selectable by a user (Fig. 3, hyperlinks 66-68; Col. 7, lines 5-15), only when it is determined that the service information includes the general information (Fig. 3; A system inherently can only display general information that is received. If no general information is present in the service information, the general information cannot be displayed.), wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information (URL for the device 10, Col. 3, lines 17-26), and obtaining and outputting the data to be output in accordance with the link information

transmitted from said link information transmitting system that is associated with the selected general information (col. 7, lines 1-15), said information output device including a printer unit that prints out data on a recording medium (Venkatraman: col. 4, lines 17-28).

7. Regarding claim 49, Venkatraman further teaches a plurality of links (Fig. 3).

8. Regarding claim 53, Venkatraman teaches a system comprising:

a link information storage that stores link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B, Memory 210, Web Page 18; Fig. 3); and

a link information transmitting system that transmits the link information to an information output device when an operation state of said electronic device satisfies a predetermined condition (Fig. 1B, Input/Output Circuitry 220; Col. 6, lines 1-30, The receipt of a request from a browser changes the operation state of the electronic device and causes it to transmit the requested link information contained in Web Page 18.),

the information output device obtaining and outputting the data to be output in accordance with the link information transmitted from said link information transmitting system (Col. 7, lines 5-15).

9. Claims 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mellquist, et al (US 6,621,823), Hereinafter "Mellquist".

10. Regarding claim 65, Mellquist teaches a system comprising:

a plurality of electronic devices (Fig. 1), each comprising:

a link information storage that stores link information indicative of location of data to be output (Fig. 3, MIB 304);

a detecting system that detects change of an operation status of the electronic device (Fig. 3, NETWORK MONITOR PROCESSES 301); and

a link transmitting system that transmits the link information when the change of the operation status is detected by the detecting system (Fig. 3; TRAP BUILDER 305), the link information relating to the change of the operation status being transmitted (Fig. 4 and 5),

an information output device comprising:

a link information receiving system that receives the link information from the link transmitting system (Fig. 3, TRAP HANDLER 402);

an outputting system that obtains and outputs that data to be output in accordance with the link information received by the link information receiving system (Fig. 3, WEB BROWSER 405).

11. Regarding claim 66, Mellquist further teaches a change in an operation status includes at least one of: (a) the electronic device being in an error state ('problems associated with appliances', col. 6, lines 43-58); (b) a consumable member of each electronic device being less than a predetermined amount; and (c) a replacement member of each electronic device being required to be replaced.

12. Regarding claim 67, Mellquist further teaches data to be output comprises a method of coping with the predetermined condition (Fig. 5, Solution).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

13. Claims 1-9, 11, 18, 20-32, 36-41, 44, 45, 58-61 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman, et al (US 6,198,479), hereinafter "Humpleman", and further in view of Venkatraman.

14. Regarding claim 1, Humpleman teaches a system comprising:

an information output device comprising:

a detecting system that detects a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

a selecting system operable by a user to select at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach each of said plurality of electronic devices stores and transmits service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output, and fails to teach the information output system further

capable of receiving service information, and displaying a listing of general information when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output, wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information. Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information.

However, Venkatraman teaches a plurality of electronic devices that store and transmit service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B, Memory 210, Input/Output Circuitry 220; Fig. 3; Col. 4, lines 5-50), and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information (Fig. 3, general information 66, 67, 68; col. 6, lines 1-55), and displaying a listing of general information only when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output (Fig. 3 displays a listing of general information 66-68 that describe the contents of the links they are associated with. Also, a system inherently can only display general information that is received. If no general information is present in the service information, the general information cannot be displayed.), wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information (URL for the device 10, Col. 3, lines 17-26). Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information (Col. 7, lines 5-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

15. Regarding claim 27, Humpleman teaches a system comprising:

a server comprising:

a detecting system that detects a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

a selecting system operable by a user to select at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach each of said plurality of electronic devices stores and transmits service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output, and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information, and displaying a listing of general information when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output, wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information. Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information.

However, Venkatraman teaches a plurality of electronic devices that store and transmit service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B, Memory 210, Input/Output Circuitry 220; Fig. 3; Col. 4, lines 5-50), and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information (Fig. 3, general information 66, 67, 68; col. 6, lines 1-55), and displaying a listing of general information only when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output (Fig. 3 displays a listing of general information 66-68 that describe the contents of the links they are associated with. Also, a system inherently can only display general information that is received. If no general information is present in the service information, the general information cannot be displayed.), wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information (URL for the device 10, Col. 3, lines 17-26). Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information (Col. 7, lines 5-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

16. Regarding claim 36, Humpleman teaches a method comprising:

detecting a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

selecting at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach each of said plurality of electronic devices stores and transmits service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output, and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information, and displaying a listing of general information when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output, wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information. Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information.

However, Venkatraman teaches a plurality of electronic devices that store and transmit service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B, Memory 210, Input/Output Circuitry 220; Fig. 3; Col. 4, lines 5-50), and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information (Fig. 3, general information 66, 67, 68; col. 6, lines 1-55), and displaying a listing of general information only when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output (Fig. 3 displays a listing of general information 66-68 that describe the contents of the links

they are associated with. Also, a system inherently can only display general information that is received. If no general information is present in the service information, the general information cannot be displayed.), wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information (URL for the device 10, Col. 3, lines 17-26). Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information (Col. 7, lines 5-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

17. Regarding claim 58, Humpleman teaches a system comprising:

an information output device comprising:

a detecting system that detects a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

a selecting system operable by a user to select at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach each of said plurality of electronic devices stores and transmits service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output, and fails to teach the information output system further

capable of receiving service information, and displaying a listing of general information when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output, wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information. Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information.

However, Venkatraman teaches a plurality of electronic devices that store and transmit service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B, Memory 210, Input/Output Circuitry 220; Fig. 3; Col. 4, lines 5-50), and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information (Fig. 3, general information 66, 67, 68; col. 6, lines 1-55), and displaying a listing of general information only when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output (Fig. 3 displays a listing of general information 66-68 that describe the contents of the links they are associated with. Also, a system inherently can only display general information that is received. If no general information is present in the service information, the general information cannot be displayed.), wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information (URL for the device 10, Col. 3, lines 17-26). Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information (Col. 7, lines 5-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

18. Regarding claims 2-5 and 25, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 1 above, including transmitting link information from an electronic device when said device is selected (Venkatraman: col. 6, lines 1-30; col. 7, lines 1-15).

19. Regarding claim 6, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 5 above, including a plurality of links (Venkatraman: Fig. 3).

20. Regarding claims 7 and 59, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 6 and 58 above, including:

a display system that displays the plurality of links (Humpleman: Fig. 7); and

a link selecting system that selects one of the plurality of links displayed ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

21. Regarding claim 8, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 6 above, including transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding pieces of service information for services provide by an electronic device (Humpleman: Fig. 11).

22. Regarding claim 9, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 6 above, including transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding general information for functions provide by an electronic device (Humpleman: Fig. 11).

23. Regarding claims 11 and 60, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 4 and 58 above, including detecting electronic devices via reply signals transmitted by the electronic devices in response to a searching signal (Humpleman: col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67).

24. Regarding claims 28 and 37, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 27 and 36 above, including transmitting link information based on the operational states of each of a plurality of electronic devices (Humpleman: col. 10, lines 1-43).

25. Regarding claims 18 and 61, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 1 and 58 above, including a printer that prints data to be outputted on recording medium (Venkatraman: col. 4, lines 17-28).

26. Regarding claims 20, 29 and 38, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 1, 28 and 37 above, including outputting web page data associated with at least one URL (Venkatraman: col. 7, lines 1-15).

27. Regarding claims 21, 22, 30, 31, 39 and 40, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 1, 28 and 37 above, including storing data to be outputted inside each electronic device (Venkatraman: col. 7, lines 14-23).

Moreover, a predetermined device connected to the network system can be the device itself.

28. Regarding claims 23, 32 and 41, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 22, 31 and 40 above, including sharing data to be outputted among a plurality of electronic devices (Venkatraman: The exemplary URL is a generic URL for HP service contracts. It would have been obvious to share such a service contract among a plurality of HP printers. col. 7, lines 14-23).

29. Regarding claim 24, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 1 above, including varying data outputted in accordance with the status of an electronic device (Humpleman: col. 10, lines 1-43).

30. Regarding claim 26, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 25 above, including transmitting output information only to information output devices among a plurality of information output devices (Venkatraman: col. 3, lines 50-60) that request said output information. (Both Humpleman and Venkatraman teach the transmission of output data only when requested to do so).

31. Regarding claim 44, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 37 above, including a request for link information (Venkatraman: col. 7, lines 1-15).

32. Regarding claim 45, Humpleman teaches a method comprising:

detecting a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

selecting at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach each of said plurality of electronic devices stores and transmits service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output, and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information, and displaying a listing of general information when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output, wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information. Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information.

However, Venkatraman teaches a plurality of electronic devices that store and transmit service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B, Memory 210, Input/Output Circuitry 220; Fig. 3; Col. 4, lines 5-50), and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information (Fig. 3, general information 66, 67, 68; col. 6, lines 1-55), and displaying a listing of general information only when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output (Fig. 3 displays a listing of general information 66-68 that describe the contents of the links they are associated with. Also, a system inherently can only display general information that is received. If no general information is present in the service information, the

general information cannot be displayed.), wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information (URL for the device 10, Col. 3, lines 17-26). Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information (Col. 7, lines 5-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

33. Regarding claim 63, Humpleman teaches a system comprising:

a server comprising:

a detecting system that detects a plurality of electronic devices connected to a network system (col. 10, line 67 – col. 12, line 67); and

a selecting system operable by a user to select at least one device from among a plurality of electronic devices ('select and control a plurality of diverse devices to communicate and perform a service', col. 2, lines 25-26).

Humpleman fails to explicitly teach each of said plurality of electronic devices stores and transmits service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output, and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information, and displaying a listing of general information when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative

of a content of the data to be output, wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information. Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information.

However, Venkatraman teaches a plurality of electronic devices that store and transmit service information including link information indicative of a location of data to be output (Fig. 1B, Memory 210, Input/Output Circuitry 220; Fig. 3; Col. 4, lines 5-50), and fails to teach the information output system further capable of receiving service information (Fig. 3, general information 66, 67, 68; col. 6, lines 1-55), and displaying a listing of general information only when it is determined that the service information includes general information indicative of a content of the data to be output (Fig. 3 displays a listing of general information 66-68 that describe the contents of the links they are associated with. Also, a system inherently can only display general information that is received. If no general information is present in the service information, the general information cannot be displayed.), wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information (URL for the device 10, Col. 3, lines 17-26). Humpleman also fails to teach obtaining and outputting data to be output in accordance with the link information associated with selected general information (Col. 7, lines 5-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit and output link information contained in link information storage as

taught by Venkatraman in the system of Humpleman with motivation to allow a user to access information contained in the webpage of a device manufacturer.

34. Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman-Venkatraman as applied to claims 5, 12 and 18 above, and further in view of what was known in the art at the time of applicant's invention.

35. Regarding claims 10 and 17, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 5 and 1 above, but fails to teach the use of the UPnP protocol.

Official notice is taken that the use of the UPnP protocol would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention. See MPEP 2144.03. One example can be found in U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0029256 (Zintel, et al).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the UPnP protocol in the system of Humpleman-Venkatraman with motivation to allow a user to easily network various electronic devices.

Moreover, "if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person's skill". See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1731 (2007).

36. Claims 13-15, 33, 34, 42, 43 and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman-Venkatraman as applied to claims 12, 28 and 53 above, and further in view of Hemphill, et al (US 6,167,448), hereinafter "Hemphill".

37. Regarding claims 33, 42 and 54, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 28, 37 and 53 above, but fails to teach the transmission of link data based on a predetermined change of operation status of an electronic device.

However, Hemphill teaches the transmission of link information in response to an event triggered by a change in the operation status of an electronic device ('ENM may also include a URL', col. 2, lines 10-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include URL information in an event message as taught by Hemphill in the system of Humpleman-Venkatraman with motivation to provide further information relating to the particular event.

38. Regarding claim 55, Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 54 above, including a predetermined condition being on of: (a) an electronic device being in an error state; (b) a consumable member of the electronic device being less than a predetermined amount; and (c) a replacement member of each electronic device being required to be replace (Hemphill: col. 5, line 41 – col. 6, line 16).

39. Regarding claims 34, 43 and 56, Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 33, 42 and 54 above, including transmitting a method of coping with a predetermined condition (Hemphill: col. 5, line 41 – col. 6, line 16).

40. Claims 19, 35, 62 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman-Venkatraman as applied to claims 1, 27, 58 and 63 above, and further in view of Mann, et al (US 6,654,801), hereinafter "Mann".

41. Regarding claims 19, 35, 62 and 64, Humpleman-Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 1, 27, 58 and 63 above, but fails to teach the transmission of output data via email to at least one email address.

However, Mann teaches the transmission of event notifications via email (col. 8, lines 56-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit event notifications via email in the system of Humpleman-Venkatraman with motivation to notify a system administrator at a remote location.

42. Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatraman as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Humpleman.

43. Regarding claim 50, Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 48 above, but fails to teach transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding pieces of service information for services provide by an electronic device.

However, Humpleman teaches transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding pieces of service information for services provide by an electronic device (Humpleman: Fig. 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a plurality of links for services provided by an electronic device as taught by Humpleman in the system of Venkatraman with motivation to allow a user to select and control a plurality of electronic devices.

44. Regarding claim 50, Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claim 48 above, but fails to teach transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding pieces of service information for services provide by an electronic device.

However, Humpleman teaches transmitting a plurality of links and corresponding general information for functions provide by an electronic device (Humpleman: Fig. 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a plurality of links for functions provided by an electronic device as taught by Humpleman in the system of Venkatraman with motivation to allow a user to select and control a plurality of electronic devices.

45. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatraman as applied to claims 48 above, and further in view of what was known in the art at the time of applicant's invention.

46. Regarding claim 52, Venkatraman teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 48 above, but fails to teach the use of the UPnP protocol.

Official notice is taken that the use of the UPnP protocol would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention. See MPEP 2144.03. One example can be found in U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0029256 (Zintel, et al).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the UPnP protocol in the system of Venkatraman with motivation to allow a user to easily network various electronic devices.

Moreover, "if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person's skill". See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1731 (2007).

47. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill as applied to claims 56 above, and further in view of what was known in the art at the time of applicant's invention.

48. Regarding claim 57, Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 56 above, but fails to teach the use of the UPnP protocol.

Official notice is taken that the use of the UPnP protocol would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention. See MPEP 2144.03. One example can be found in U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0029256 (Zintel, et al).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the UPnP protocol in the system of Humpleman-Venkatraman-Hemphill with motivation to allow a user to easily network various electronic devices.

Moreover, "if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person's skill". See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1731 (2007).

49. Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellquist as applied to claims 65 above, and further in view of what was known in the art at the time of applicant's invention.

50. Regarding claim 68, Mellquist teaches the invention substantially as claimed and described in claims 65 above, but fails to teach the use of the UPnP protocol.

Official notice is taken that the use of the UPnP protocol would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention. See MPEP 2144.03. One example can be found in U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0029256 (Zintel, et al).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the UPnP protocol in the system of Mellquist with motivation to allow a user to easily network various electronic devices.

Moreover, "if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person's skill". See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1731 (2007).

Response to Arguments

51. Applicant's arguments filed 01/11/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In response to applicant's traversal of the Official notice taken, the Office provides evidentiary support above. Since the newly added reference is added only as directly corresponding evidence to support the prior common knowledge finding, it does not result in a new issue or constitute a new ground of rejection. MPEP 2144.03(D).

b. Applicant argues that Venkatraman does not teach the listing of general information as claimed because it displays a web page 18 even if it does not contain embedded links 66-68. In response to applicant's argument that the

references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., displaying nothing when general information is not present) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant only claims displaying a listing of general information when general information is present in the service information. Applicant does not claim that nothing can be displayed. Web Page 18 of Venkatraman includes both a listing of general information, associated with hyperlinks 66-68, and text. The system of Venkatraman inherently cannot display the listing of general information if the service information (i.e., Web Page 18) does not contain any general information.

c. Applicant argues that Venkatraman fails to teach the limitation "wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information". However, Venkatraman teaches the displaying of service information, which includes a listing of general information, occurs in accordance with the device URL, and not the URL associated with the general information. The selection of the URLs associated with the general information causes the system to display subsequent web pages (Col. 7, lines 5-15).

d. With regard to claim 53, Applicant argues that Venkatraman fails to teach the transmission of link information when an operation state of an electronic device satisfies a predetermined condition. However, Venkatraman teaches the

transmission of link information in response to a request from a web browser. The receipt of a request from a browser changes the operation state of the electronic device and causes it to transmit the requested link information contained in Web Page 18. Therefore, Venkatraman teaches the transmission of link information when an operation state of an electronic device satisfies a predetermined condition.

e. Any argument(s) not addressed has been rendered moot in view of the above.

Conclusion

52. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

53. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JULIAN CHANG whose telephone number is (571)272-8631. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JC

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152